

REMARKS

Claims 6-13 and 16-23 are now pending in the application. Claims 6 and 10 have been amended and claims 16-23 are added as new. Claims 1-5 and 14-15 have been canceled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on April 2, 2009. During that interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiners discussed the proposed amendments to incorporate claims 14 and 15 separately into claim 10. While no formal agreement was reached, the Examiners indicated that they would study the proposed amendments and that adding the limitations of claims 14 and 15 separately into claim 10 may advance prosecution of this application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,901).

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,901) in view of Smith (U.S. Pat. No. 6,792,515).

Claims 6-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,901) in view of Smith (U.S. Pat. No. 6,792,515), and further in view of Gleeson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,763,023).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-5 and 14-15 are canceled. Claim 6 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of the allowable claim 14. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-9 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

The previously presented claim 10 recites features similar to the previously presented claim 6. Claim 10 has been further amended to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 14. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-13 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 16-23 are new. Applicant has rewritten the allowable claim 15 in independent form as claim 16, including all of the limitations of the previously presented claims 6 and 15. Newly added claims 17, 18 and 19, depending from claim 16, recite all of the limitations of claims 7, 8 and 9, respectively.

Newly added claim 20 incorporates all of the limitations of the previously presented claims 10 and 15. The previously presented claim 10 recites features similar to the previously presented claim 6. Newly added claims 21, 22 and 23, depending from claim 20, recite all of the limitations of claims 11, 12 and 13, respectively.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes the new claims 16-23 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the base claim 6 to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 14. Applicant has rewritten claim 15 in independent form as claim 20. Therefore, claims 14 and 20 should be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 3, 2009

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm

14302822.1